DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 796 HE 019 045

AUTHOR Ruscio, Kenneth P.
TITLE Many Sectors, Many Professions. Comparative Higher Education Research Group. Working Paper #7.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Graduate School of Education
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York, N.Y.; EXXON Education Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Nov 85
NOTE 69p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; College Environment; *College Faculty; College Instruction; College Role; Community Colleges; *Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Workload; *Governance; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Intellectual Disciplines; Organizational Climate; Research; Scholarship; State Colleges; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Role; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Diversity (Institutional); *Institutional Mission; Research Universities

ABSTRACT

The heterogeneity within the academic profession in work arrangements, institutional governance, and academicians' values and beliefs are described. Observations are based on interviews with about 150 faculty members from 16 types of institutions and in six subject fields: physics, biology, political science, English, medicine, and business. The following assumptions are made: (1) institutional structure shapes the professorial role; (2) institutional differences operate more covertly than disciplinary differences; (3) a large division of labor exists within the professoriat; and (4) the turbulence of the United States higher education system causes some institutions to accumulate various missions that lead to idiosyncratic combinations of academics at the college. The diverse types of institutions (e.g., research universities, community colleges, elite liberal arts colleges) have different missions and serve different populations. Emphasis on faculty teaching and research roles is linked in part to institutional mission. Examples of authority arrangements at colleges indicate factors influencing faculty participation in governance. It is noted that as higher education systems divide into different work and governance settings, beliefs, attitudes, and ideologies of the academic profession are fragmented. A four-page bibliography concludes the paper. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FD2657796

Working Paper #7

MANY SECTORS, MANY PROFESSIONS

Kenneth P. Ruscio

ED190495

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Burton Clark,
Comparative Higher Educ Group, UCLA
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Working Paper #7

MANY SECTORS, MANY PROFESSIONS

Kenneth P. Ruscio

November 1985

Kenneth P. Ruscio
Assistant Professor of Political Science
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Massachusetts
(Research Associate, 1983-85, CHERG)

The research and reflection reported in this paper has been part of the work conducted by the UCLA Comparative Higher Education Research Group. The research has been supported by funds from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for a study of the American academic profession, and by grants from the Carnegie Foundation and the Exxon Education Foundation for an international conference on the academic profession in cross-national perspective. This paper will appear in Burton R. Clark (ed.), The Academic Profession in Europe and America (tentative title), 1986 forthcoming.

In the interest of fullest possible circulation of information and ideas, the Comparative Higher Education Research Group reproduces and circulates these Working Papers at the request of authors who are affiliated with the Group. The views expressed are those of the author.

Copies of the Working Papers are distributed without charge to those scholars, administrators, and librarians who have indicated they would like to be on our international mailing list. Copies of particular papers may be obtained upon request by writing to the address below.

Comparative Higher Education Research Group
Graduate School of Education
320 Moore Hall
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

MANY SECTORS, MANY PROFESSIONS

Kenneth P. Ruscio

An academic's role -- his tasks, attitudes, behavior, sense of professionalism, and sense of being a part of a larger academic community -- is a function of the institution to which he is attached. But the institution is not the sole determinant; the discipline also exerts a powerful influence on him. Both discipline and institution thus link the individual to the profession. Contrary to some descriptions, the two do not compete until one subdues the other into submission, transforming the professor into either a "local" or a "cosmopolitan." Instead, a subtle, intricate interaction with many nuances occurs as we move through the various disciplines and across the many institutions, each with its own culture. Biologists speak of a genotype and a phenotype. The genotype represents the fundamental instructions to the organism and its potential for survival and growth; the phenotype represents the actual manifestation of that potential in a particular physical setting. In the nature-nurture debate a middle position is becoming increasingly consensual: each organism has a blueprint, the expression of which depends upon the environment, with some traits and characteristics remaining forever latent and others fully revealing themselves. From this perspective we view the American academic profession as a creature of its organizational setting. What distinguishes the American professoriat and makes it so complicated and intriguing is not the genotype (the academic profession everywhere organizes itself around areas of knowledge

or disciplines) but the phenotype: American higher education is characterized by an array of extremely diverse institutional settings.

If academics in the United States have come to accept institutional diversity and the consequent division of labor as admirable accommodations to the widely scattered and often conflicting demands placed upon the system of higher education, they at times seem unwilling to accept, or are uncomfortable with, the academic profession as a mirror for that diversity. Acknowledging that the academician at a modest unknown college and his purported counterpart at an elite research university perform differently, have different incentives, and receive awards based on different criteria rubs against the belief that all academics are united by a common bond of lofty values, sometimes called a scientific ethos. Perhaps some of the discomfort derives from the "united we stand, divided we fall" notion, which implies that a plurality of interests is vulnerable to greater control from nonprofessional, nonacademic powers outside the academy. A countervailing aphorism then might be "know thyself." To overlook the diversity within the profession exposes it to a false sense of solidarity. This chapter describes the heterogeneity within the profession in arrangements of work, patterns of institutional governance, and the values and beliefs of academics. The discussion is guided by the following premises:

1. Institutional structure shapes the professorial role. Structures of postsecondary educational institutions reflect their missions. Since missions vary considerably, structures and professorial roles will similarly differ. Consequently, a political scientist who belongs to a

department with only one other colleague and who devotes 20 percent of his time to research probably conducts a very different type of investigation than a political scientist in a much larger department who also spends 20 percent of his time in research.

2. Institutional differences operate more covertly than disciplinary differences. Diverse disciplinary cultures are a readily acknowledged condition of the profession and receive tacit acceptance through the formal structures of departments (this is not to say that we understand the implications of the disciplinary differences). Institutional differences, however, remain in the shadows. Disciplines are the first mark of identity a professor receives; institutional affiliation comes after the training, after the socialization. It is often depicted as a necessary evil to be tolerated in the performance of a professor's real duties. A discipline provides the opportunity; an institution imposes the obligation. And, except in rare cases of highly distinctive colleges, the institutional ethos lacks the clarity and sharpness of the disciplinary one. Yet institutional affiliation is indispensable to a professor's identity.

3. The preceding two propositions imply a greater division of labor within the professoriat. It also suggests the rise of separate professions, taking "profession" to mean different work styles, reference groups, objectives, organization of authority, and attitudes.

4. The turbulence of the higher education system in the United States causes some institutions, over time, to accumulate various missions that, like geological rock strata, layer themselves one upon the other, resulting in peculiar combinations. This, in turn, leads to idiosyncratic combinations of academics.

Though institutional boundaries are a convenient demarcation between clusters of academics, the situation is actually more complicated. There is diversity within diversity as different types of professionals exist side by side in the same setting.

The observations presented here are largely the products of intensive interviews, lasting between one and two hours, with nearly 150 members of the American professoriat;they are the outcomes of research done as part of the UCLA Academic Profession Study. With a sample chosen to range across different kinds of universities and colleges, as well as across disciplines, the interviews were correlated in sixteen institutions representing six institutional types -- from leading research universities to community colleges -- and in six subject fields --physics, biology, political science, English, medicine, and business. The preceding two chapters in this volume focused on disciplinary differences. Here my attention is given to institutional settings and their effects.

I set out by establishing and portraying the rich institutional diversity of American higher education. Three areas of analysis follow: the implications of this diversity for an academic's work; his participation in institutional governance, and his values and attitudes. These components were not chosen randomly. They provide important bases for cross-national comparisons among systems of higher education.[1]

DIVERSITY

Diversity is the central feature of American higher education, but differences among the professoriat in different institutions have never attracted much attention. When Logan Wilson wrote The Academic Man in

1942, he confined his research to such leading universities as Harvard, Chicago, Columbia, and "others that rank high in the universe of learning." These places were surely more pleasant and easier to visit than an isolated liberal arts or a rural land-grant college, but even then were unlike other institutions in the country. Understandably, Wilson's academic man was a scholar frustrated by the burdens of administration and teaching.[2]

Despite a few such important statements as Lazarfeld and Thielens's The Academic Mind, research on the profession faltered; it wasn't until the 1960s that the topic was resurrected -- and then in a dramatic fashion. Reporting on the "academic revolution," Jencks and Riesman found that the academic profession had taken over higher education. "The shape of American higher education," they wrote, "is largely a response to the assumptions and demands of the academic profession."[3] To demonstrate their thesis, they studied colleges with highly distinctive missions, such as historically black, church-related, and single-sex institutions . Finding consistencies throughout the colleges more significant than differences, they predicted that, "the model for the future is the 'university-college,' and the result is likely to be a continuing trend toward meritocracy."[4]

Responding in part to Jencks and Riesman, Ladd and Lipset asserted, a few years later, that the picture was considerably altered. In their study The Divided Academy, they found a variety of political attitudes and opinions among what was purportedly a relatively homogeneous group of professors. Curiously, they attributed the differences primarily

to individual disciplinary backgrounds, and it wasn't until they discussed unionization and collective bargaining that institutional differences seemed to have become a central concern. An intriguing paradox surfaced: although the most politically conservative professors were among those more frequently found at nonelite colleges and the more liberally inclined were those at the the elite universities, the sentiment for faculty unionization was much stronger among the most conservative. The authors attributed this in part to the very different views of the profession, and thus cast some doubt on the idea of a consistent, agreed-upon definition of an "academic."[5]

A different kind of book came along more recently (1983; its subtitle, The Management Revolution, suggests that its thesis runs counter to the theories of Jencks and Riesman. George Keller attacks the notion that the academic profession is a self-regulating group of scholars who run their institutions. "The basic myth is that each college is close to an Athenian democracy of professorial scholars who know each other and share a bundle of values and aspirations which they practice in their institutional lives."[6] Faculty ought to recognize that their professional identities are also intertwined with membership in an organization. Sounding the call for an academic counterrevolution, Keller proclaimed, "Retrenchment, constricting finances, new competition, marketing, and rapid changes in the academic and demographic areas all spell the end of the traditional, unobtrusive style of organizational leadership on campuses."[7]

The interaction between the professor and the institution is thus an issue of some significance and timeliness. The first task, then, is to describe the institutional setting, especially its diversity, and offer an explanation of why differences among colleges are increasing.

In 1982, 12.3 million students, 86 percent of whom were undergraduates, attended 2,661 postsecondary institutions. Doctoral-granting universities accounted for 6.2 percent of the total institutional population, comprehensive colleges (diverse postgraduate programs, but no significant doctoral production) 15.3 percent, general baccalaureate-awarding colleges 27.4 percent, and two-year institutions 45.6 percent. Enrollments differ widely among institutions, with some colleges accepting about one hundred students and some universities having close to 50,000. Faculty size also varies considerably. Although nearly half of the institutions are community colleges, they enlist less than a quarter (22 percent) of the full-time institutional faculty while universities, fewer in number, employ nearly 32 percent. Four-year colleges make up the difference (46 percent).[8] The diversity becomes even more apparent when the significant influence of part-time faculty is taken into account. No reliable figures exist on that group; one frequently cited estimate claims that nearly one-third of the total number of 667,000 faculty are part-time.[9] Moreover, the use of part-timers varies throughout the system: community colleges rely disproportionately on these individuals, a strategy that permits them to respond to the often volatile demands on their curricula.

But the raw statistics cannot possibly convey the extreme qualitative differences existing throughout the system and within the sectors. As

higher education moved from an elite system to one that offered virtually unlimited access to graduates of secondary schools, the institutions began to distinguish themselves from one another, to carve out portions of a diverse market, and to adapt to the numerous demands placed upon them by diverse constituencies. There was a division of labor. No single institution or single sector could possibly simultaneously accommodate demands for excellence and access; thus colleges and universities, sometimes deliberately and sometimes compelled by external forces, acquired functions and developed roles different from their postsecondary cousins -- circumstances that enabled the system to responsively enlarge its place in society.

Clearly, institutional missions, whether of research universities or community colleges, elite or nonelite liberal arts colleges, state universities or comprehensive colleges, are undergoing reassessment and introspection. Consider, for example, the state colleges. Pulled by the research glamour of the leading universities, pushed by the preferences of budget-controlling legislatures to contribute to the economic growth of the state, and confused by the pragmatic demands of the students who enroll in such large numbers, the "college of the forgotten American" is allowing its "once sharp mission" to fade into an "undistinguished comprehensiveness." As put by George Weathersby, "Many state colleges have decided that a clear mission is less desirable than a large institution that is diffuse in purpose. Such vagueness of purpose has in turn led to confusion in the minds of students, employers, potential donors, and legislators about the identity, purpose and priorities of these institutions."[10] Attempts to define the role are usually processes of elimination cast in

negative terms: state colleges are not research universities or liberal arts colleges, nor are they supposed to preempt the technical and vocational training of the community colleges. But an overview of a state college would show some research, some conventional liberal arts instruction, and some vocational services, in varying degrees, depending on the specific institution.

Research universities also have their concerns. "The leading American universities have never had any clear objectives; the university is confused as to its social role and political obligations, is divided internally, and is the object of political dispute."[11] But what appears to be confusion may be an ingenious adaptation to conflicting demands. Clark Kerr argues that in the multiversity, the organizational complexity of the modern research university is actually a means of coping with an array of research, teaching, and service missions.[12] Whatever the interpretation, research universities have at least a set of objectives that may be contradictory; the trick is to minimize the situations where many contradictory objectives collide.

Community colleges are perhaps organizationally the most confusing, since enormous variation exists within that sector. In some regions, especially the Northeast, community colleges traditionally educate students along conventional lines, intending to transfer them to other colleges for completion of the baccalaureate. In other locations this transfer function is shared with, and frequently surpassed by, an occupational one. The colleges also differ by size, which is perhaps the primary predictor of other differences. Though the diversity within this sector

cannot be fully addressed here, one characteristic ought to be noted. Students, even within the same college and the same classroom, may range from high school seniors to retired workers seeking continuing education to college graduates retraining for a new career. This last category -- the "reverse transfer" -- is becoming an increasingly widespread phenomenon. In short, the demands on the community college are multiple; a common thread, however, would surely center around the overwhelmingly complex instructional burden.

If diversity is predictable in the community college sector, a relatively new group of colleges that arose during a short period of time, it is not predictable in the liberal arts sector, which has existed throughout the history of higher education in the United States. Liberal arts colleges have maintained a relatively consistent commitment to the ideal of providing general knowledge and the development of intellectual capacities. Once the distinction between nonelite and elite is acknowledged, some uniformity across the colleges appears. Unlike community colleges, liberal arts colleges are almost entirely private and are uniformly small. Students are usually from the traditional eighteen-to-twenty-two year age group, although several nonelite colleges facing severe declines in the numbers of these students are designing alternative programs to attract the nontraditional student. Even in this seemingly homogeneous world, mission is under stress. Lord Ashby has noted that "the prime purpose of the liberal arts bachelor course in a four-year college is not clear any longer, and in many colleges the concentration on preparing students to enter professional schools makes it difficult for those

colleges to develop an independent and indigenous curriculum."[13] Barzun noted that liberal arts colleges are being threatened from two directions: from below, high schools and community colleges invade the first two years of the curriculum; from above, graduate and professional schools infiltrate the last two years.[14] The result is that some colleges trade up and others trade down, a practice that may result in severe tensions between liberal arts and occupational subjects.[15] Some colleges now claim the "applied" liberal arts as their forte, a semantic creation which allows them to maintain credibility with their old constitutencies while seducing new ones.

The point is not that the missions of the sectors are confused or ambiguous. Rather, they are different and set apart from other institutions, having been designed to accommodate a particular segment of the higher education market. This may be explained in part by an almost inalterable law of organizational behavior: as demands increase and constituencies diversify, there must be a structural response by the system, usually in the form of increased differentiation.

In higher education a more subtle explanation also bears heavily on a discussion of the professoriat. In general, American higher education is highly interactive with its constituencies. Walter Metzger has pointed out that colleges and universities today are "delocalized." Though an institution used to operate with little direct interference from society and made decisions relatively unimpeded by outside forces, we may now observe "the flow of decisional power from authorities on the campus to those resident outside. Richer, larger, more complex than

before, the typical modern institution is less self-directive than before."[16] While delocalization may be a pervasive trend throughout higher education, and important too for a discussion of the professoriat, it assumes different patterns in different institutions and sectors: there are in fact distinctly "local" patterns of delocalization. The influence of the federal government on a university that receives a substantial amount of research support from it will be, for example, significantly different than the impact of the local or state government on a community college. Conversely, the impact of the surrounding town will be far different for a community college than for a research university and will differ in still other ways for a state college.

For higher education systems, "fragmentation is the dominant force. It is in the nature of academic systems to be increasingly pluralistic in the production of patterns of thought and in the precise definitions of proper behavior."[17] The impact of this fragmentation on the academic profession and the resulting differences among the academic professoriat are very likely not simply small adjustments of a pervasive ethos to minor local variations; instead, they are significant phenomena that severely question the existence of a unified, integrated community of scholars.

WORK

Compared to the end results of other organizations, the transmission and creation of knowledge give birth to intangible products. They require a mixture of tasks that, joined together, reflect individual preferences, disciplinary backgrounds, and institutional imperatives. This being

true, the academic world has a relatively high tolerance for idiosyncracy in work habits; styles vary considerably within departments and institutions. They also vary across sectors, where random differences appear to arrange themselves into discernible patterns. Three propositions about the sectorial activities of academics are here suggested.

First, some research is performed in all sectors. True, not all academics engage in research nor do they practice it in equal amounts in all sectors. According to Fulton and Trow's analysis of the 1969 Carnegie Commission survey data, [18] and as shown in Table 1, research (defined as publication) hangs by a slim thread in community colleges, but nearly 80 percent of those employed in high quality research universities claim it as an activity they perform. Between these two extremes, research activity and institutional quality decrease in tandem, with a sharp break occurring between universities of medium and low quality and another between four-year colleges of high and medium quality. There are thus four general categories: high and medium quality universities; lower-level universities and elite four-year colleges; other four-year colleges; and community colleges.

Table 1 about here

Defining research in terms of publication has its problems, although it is hard to think of a more appropriate surrogate measure. Even so, other evidence tends to corroborate that academics in different sectors devote a significant amount of time to noninstructional activities. In

1981 the National Science Foundation reported the results of an intensive survey of science, social science, and engineering faculty.[19] With the sample divided into two broad institutional categories -- universities (doctorate-granting) and four-year colleges (nondoctorate granting) -- the survey requested the faculty to keep a weekly log of how they spent their time. Tables 2 and 3 display some interesting and predictable patterns. University faculty devote significantly more time to research and less time to instructional activities. They also spend slightly more time on general administrative tasks and on efforts that produce income beyond the faculty salary.

Table 2 about here

Across the disciplines, different patterns, even within the same sector, are evident. In universities, for example, political scientists spend considerably more time on instructional activities in, and especially out of, the classroom and considerably less time on research than do their colleagues in the biological sciences. Some of the data also support Fulton and Trow's hypothesis that research activitity in a research setting translates into institutional power: individuals in disciplines with higher rates of research spend more time on administrative tasks. The exceptions are in engineering and economics, two disciplines in which more than average amount of time is spent on consulting. In those subject areas that tend to be highly interactive with their constituencies, consulting opportunities may be a function of previous success in research, and consulting may supplant some portion of research time.

All disciplines make relatively heavy demands for teaching in four-year colleges, but the heaviest are in the natural, not the social, sciences, a reversal of the pattern found in universities. This is very likely a result of the laboratory time required. Also, to judge from this data, the most active researchers in nondoctorate-granting colleges are in the social sciences. Fulton and Trow found little differences in publication rates among the disciplines in these institutions; this raises questions about the ways in which research is construed across the disciplines and, as we shall see below, across the institutions.[20]

Table 3 here

A second proposition strongly supported in the literature is that, despite the presence of research in all sectors, teaching is the dominant preferred activity. Again, the results of the Carnegie survey are instructive. In answer to the question, "Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or research?," only 4 percent indicated a strong attraction for research while another 20 percent leaned toward it. Forty-three percent, however, reported a heavy interest in teaching, while 34 percent were inclined toward it. Table 4 shows that predictably, these interests vary by sector. Like the distribution of research activity, research preference falls into the same four categories: high and medium quality universities;
low quality universities and elite four-year colleges; other four-year colleges; and community colleges.

Table 4 about here

Such findings permit Everett Ladd to state, "There is, on the surface, a fairly good fit between what faculty want to do -- as teachers and researchers -- and what they are required to do."[21] Interviews with faculty tend to support that interpretation. At one elite liberal arts college, an assistant professor in physics reports that he spends about 80 percent of his work time (sixty to seventy hours per week) on teaching.

> Teaching is an extremely high priority for me. I am in these kinds of institutions because I like to teach, and it is very important to me. It is very challenging, it is very satisfying. Research is also challenging, satisfying, and rewarding but I find teaching a little more so. Therefore, my priorities will always be on that side, not to the extent of excluding research, just to the extent of it not being more important and not taking a greater percentage of my time.

Of course, there may be resistance to oppressive teaching loads regardless of the sector: a preference for teaching relative to research is not the same as a request for more courses to teach. When asked how they would prefer to spend their time -- compared with how they actually spend it -- most academics mention a desire for more research time. If this is interpreted more broadly as discretionary time that would allow

the academic to "keep up in the field" (in teaching settings) or to be relieved of administrative chores (in all settings), such requests are not all inconsistent with the earlier findings of a teaching temperament throughout academe. One English professor who teaches eight different courses a year lamented the time spent in teaching. "As a faculty we have been trying to negotiate any kind of lightening of the teaching load. I find, increasingly, that by the time I have done the work that I have to for school -- preparation, and the like -- there is no time left for anything else .... Even to read a whole novel seems like a complete frivolity." When asked if he would like to do research with any extra time, he said he "would probably do just enough to get tenure."

If the favored normative stance of academics is teaching, then the third proposition about the work styles of academics is somewhat paradoxical: "Faculty believe that the most meritorious behavior of academic man is the performance of significant research."[22] This stands as one of the most curious characteristics of American higher education. Wilson found in 1942 that "professional recognition is achieved through activities engaging a minor portion of the average man's energies."[23] Some twenty years later, Caplow and McGee also noted the anomaly: "Perhaps the leading problem for the individual faculty member," they wrote, "is the incongruity between his job assignment and the work which determines his success or failure in the discipline."[24] Certainly part of the reason for this is a "Gresham's law" of academic evaluation: the hard, tangible results of research productivity drive out the soft, intangible contributions of teaching or service to the institution. And academic status or

national recognition still depends upon criteria that can be easily compared across institutions; the relatively ambiguous criterion of instructional quality stands in poor contrast to reputation in the discipline.

These three propositions together present a confusing state. Patterns of work across institutions differ significantly, yet there is only one model for the profession.[25] Depending on the setting, this one model has several different versions. Each sector seems to worship the god of research, but organized religion reflects the local culture. Some are more religious than others; and some allow religion to play a different role in their lives.

Clearly, disciplinary labor is divided. The activities of the professor and the rationale for those activities reflect the mission of the college; because the structures of the institutions vary so much, they also influence the way certain tasks are performed. Taking the clearest example -- the liberal arts college -- discussions with faculty members in the sciences, social sciences, and the humanities reveal a cynical attitude toward the leaders in the discipline. "Trivial," "insignificant," and "narrow" are used to describe most of the research found in the leading journals. Such failings are blamed, by liberal arts college members, on the counterproductive publish-or-perish syndrome. As one less critical biology professor termed it, those in the research universities excel in "vertical" research; by contrast, those in the high quality liberal arts college excel in "horizontal" research that transcends the discplines and provides innovative ways of looking at the current state of knowledge.

There are good reasons why a faculty member at a liberal arts college would take this stance. He teaches undergraduates, most of whom have only a rudimentary knowledge of the discipline, and whose interest will likely extend no farther than the next semester. Also, the faculty member belongs to a department consisting of only a few colleagues chosen to cover the entire discipline. Rarely do two members of the same subfield have the opportunity to work together. The teaching load is heavy; the coverage of topics broad; the audience are generalists; and colleagues specialize in different fields.

Nevertheless, an obstacle in one setting may turn out to be an opportunity in another. The chances of socializing and collaborating with faculty members in other disciplines appear to be greater in liberal arts colleges. A biologist was planning a course with members of the drama department on how scientists are viewed in films, while a political scientist and a literature professor jointly taught a course on politics and the novel, a subject about which they had also written. The breadth required to teach a variety of courses forces the teacher to make connections across subfields, a luxury not afforded to those who must specialize.

Within institutions and departments there is a research context shaped by interrelated structural variables. These include department size, generality of courses (e.g. ratio of graduate to undergraduate courses taught by an individual), teaching load, coverage of subfields, and interaction with other departments. We can hypothesize that the nature of research is determined in part by the organizational setting.

Other major influences shaping the nature of research are its rationale or purpose and the institutional attitudes toward it. At a liberal arts college one department responded to faculty dissatisfaction with teaching obligations by instituting a policy whereby faculty were expected to spend one day a week "investing in future students," a euphemism for research. Teaching remains the core activity around which other activities revolve. In this case faculty would spend roughly 20 percent of their time keeping up in the field, conducting research, and writing -- activities taking them away from current students but enabling them to better serve future students. A molecular biologist at a leading research university, in contrast, spoke of his love of teaching because he was training future researchers in biochemistry. His commitment to teaching sounded as passionate as any voiced at a liberal arts college but for a very different reason: a much different activity reinforced his commitment to the discipline that was clearly his primary motivation.

Along with these diverse rationales for research come different definitions for it. At a leading research university, the demands for excellence in scholarship are apt to be precise and well understood. On the other hand, scholarship at a liberal arts college may be more broadly defined. One respondent spoke of tenure awarded on the basis of a "gestalt." Here, in evaluating a professor's record, the department and the administration look for contributions demonstrating professional vitality, their precise nature varying from case to case. In another liberal arts college, a rating of excellence in scholarship is awarded

if the individual has met the following conditions: 1. pursued a systematic research and study program leading toward further publication or the presentation of a new course; 2. authored a high-quality book or an equivalent set of articles and/or monographs; or (instead of this) 3. devised a set of procedures or a syllabus that may be expected to substantially change the teaching of the discipline in first-rate colleges and universities.[26]

The contrast between research at a liberal arts college and a research university illustrates a trend that is likely to exacerbate this disciplinary division of labor. Repeatedly, we heard that disciplines themselves are increasingly fragmented because of the specialization required to make a contribution. Historically, biology has been a federated discipline comprised of numerous subfields. In the United States there are now over 100 professional associations in this field, two of which periodically attempt, always unsuccessfully, to unite some of the others. Physics is a more integrated field. Still, most of the scientific conferences tend to consist of irregular meetings of specialists focusing on a particular problem. In this way the invisible college is institutionalized, placing further barriers between leading researchers and those doing horizontal research. The American Political Science Association reported a 25-percent decrease in membership over the last ten years; it blames this decline on increasing specialization and proliferation of splinter organizations.[27] As disciplines become more fragmented and the need to specialize becomes greater, academics in institutions that emphasize undergraduate teaching and introductory courses will find themselves either having less affinity with the academic

research community or experiencing a sharper and less complementary distinction between research and teaching. Increasing differentiation among institutions interacts with increasing fragmentation of the disciplines.

Liberal arts colleges and research universities provide excellent illustrations of the differences in work patterns, but structures and missions of colleges in other sectors similarly place their distinctive imprint on the work of academics. Instructors at a community college identified themselves as educators not as members of a discipline (e.g., political scientists, biologists, physicists, and the like). According to the president of the college, "The discipline is the means for the community college teacher -- not the end. We simply view the discipline as the means, the tool .... I am reaching students, but my means happens to be English composition, or American history, or economics." In this college there were no departments, only divisions; the teaching load for each instructor was five courses a semester. One instructor with a doctorate in American diplomatic history taught courses in political science, American history, American government, and European history. Given these structural constraints, it is not surprising that instructors devote nearly all of their time to teaching and working with students.

Yet another pattern may emerge at a state or comprehensive college. These institutions vary from state to state and region to region. But, in some colleges where the teaching load is heavy and where research is encouraged but only minimally supported, academics can fashion innovative professional careers outside the college and outside the conventional boundaries of the discipline. An example is the English professor who

appears regularly on local television and who edits a quasi serious, widely read newsletter lampooning the educational system. Another is a political scientist located near Washington and New York who writes commentaries for newpapers and consults frequently with international organizations. A business professor consults nearly three days a week with a real estate firm. A political scientist becomes heavily involved in environmental causes, assuming a variety of leadership roles in associations committed to the cause. Though all were reticent to call these activities "research," they did consider them an important part of their professional lives. Academics in other sectors occasionally assume these roles, but the incidence of this pattern in state and comprehensive colleges seems to surpass the practice elsewhere, suggesting that the broad missions of these institutions and the affinity these institutions have for these local constituencies are reflected in extremely catholic views of the profession among its faculty.

Work patterns differ among the professoriat, but there are other ways of viewing fragmentation. How faculty govern themselves, for example, varies by institution. It is to these differences we now turn.

AUTHORITY

Education, as a process, does not easily fit within organizational constraints. Organizations, by definition, impose routines, eliminate personal vagaries and have a predisposition toward an efficiency not always hospitable to the creativity and individualism required in the pursuit of knowledge. Nevertheless, the activities of higher education do indeed fall within organizations and must therefore continually

balance administrative and educative imperatives. Of course not every decision has both an administrative and an educational dimension, nor do the two necessarily clash, the one prevailing over the other. On the contrary, any decision results from the blend. Kim Cameron explained, in a slightly different context, that higher education institutions are "Janusian." Like the two-faced Roman god Janus, they must always look toward two directions simultaneously and must act upon apparently contradictory demands.[28] But as we look across the sectors of higher education and peer more closely at specific institutions, we find some settings characterized by a management temperament and others by an academic temperament. This distinction is akin to the difference between collegial and bureaucratic forms of governance, except that "temperament" better conveys the idea that authority arrangements, aside from having a formal structure, also depend upon the attitudes and perceptions of the participants.

The present situation in higher education is extremely complex. There are distinctly local forms of governance fashioned by the history of the institution, the organizational structure, the leadership style of past and present administrators, and the overall mission of the college. As these independent variables change, so does each form of governance. And so does the "temperament." A managerial spirit arises in settings where the faculty, their representatives, and the administration debate issues similar to those in a conventional employer-employee relationship. There are managers and employees. There are discussions about work loads, assigned office hours, and salaries. Organizational expectations for individuals become formalized and quantified. By

contrast, an academic temperament reflects a more guild-like approach: decentralized decisions; reliance on the professional's expertise; and tolerance for redundancy and ambiguity in decision making.

An institution does not have one temperament to the exclusion of the other; more often one type sets the tone for some decisions, whereas the other provides a particular ambiance for different ones. But the distinction has some validity on its face. As higher education institutions require more and more management, the role of the faculty in governance evolves and adjusts to local conditions. The patterns become distinctly different, and the severity of the tension between a managerial and an academic perspective is one general indicator of the differences. To explain this a more systematic approach is required, beginning with the construction of a simple model.

The faculty role in governance is shaped by organizational design. A model of the design is a heuristic device that does not capture reality; it serves as a standard. After the organization's deviation from the standard is determined, comparisons may be made between institutions and across sectors.

The basic components are the organizational units. They form a chain beginning with individual faculty members and move in sequence to the department, the school or division, the college, the system, and the governmental bodies. Each link in the chain constitutes an authority relationship, and each relationship has different characteristics. The connection between the individual and his department, for example, though formal and rule-bound in some respects, may also be very informal,

marked by exchanges in the corridor, advice from senior to junior members, or lunches at the faculty center. In contrast, the connection between the institution and the system assumes the intricate configuration of an organization in relation to its environment.

But the authority arrangements in higher education are not a simple hierarchy. Among many other permutations there is a network of relations between the individual and the college, the department and the legal bodies, so that complexity can best be conveyed by arranging the components -- there are five in this very simple case -- horizontally and vertically in a matrix-like fashion. The resulting five-by-five matrix forms twenty-five cells, each having its own distinctive relationships. An individual's role in governance becomes a function of interaction with the department, the college, the system, and the legal bodies.

The matrix becomes a web, and complexity becomes even more apparent when mechanisms for collective faculty action enter the picture. Faculty senates, collective bargaining agents, and ubiquitous committees weave in and out of the matrix, raising the number of interactions geometrically and rendering governance structures even more complex. At one small liberal arts college the list of committees and subcommittees assigned to handle certain issues could not be described in less than four pages. Also, a faculty senate ratified such decisions as course changes, but not others, as budget and tenure. The college was not part of a large public system, nor did it have many divisions, such as graduate or professional schools, but it was a complex structure. To discover the precise location of a decision was difficult; to trace the informal influences or formal constraints on the decision was especially so.

Referring to this simple model, the following examples illustrate how faculty members fit into very different authority structures. The diversity is apparent. What is less apparent are the generalizable explanations for the disparities. Clearly, authority arrangements are moving from simple to complex, from informal to formal, from normative to instrumental, from soft to hard, from unspoken to spoken. In large public systems "the drift of authority for a quarter century has been steadily upward, toward a growing web of multicampus administrations, coordinating boards of higher education, state legislative committees and executive offices, regional associations and a large number of agencies of the federal government."[29] Along with this upward flow, there is a steady downward movement of constraints that circumscribe decisions. Though the nominal decision may remain in the hands of a department or a faculty senate, other units of authority may significantly limit the options. The first example illustrates this quite well, as it also illustrates the tension between the managerial and academic temperaments.

At a small community college where faculty morale seems fairly high, an instructor explained his ability to influence decisions by saying "the administration gives us a lot of power." When asked if this formulation ought to be reversed, if it were said that the power was already in the hands of the faculty to give, he replied that in any organization the responsibility for the consequences of a decision must must be clearly assigned and therefore could not be apportioned among a collective body. The president of the college echoed this philosophy:

> The faculty does not run the college, not at all. First of all, we are a very tight state system. I believe that, ultimately, the president, within the bounds of the (State) Board guidelines, must make the final decision. The faculty member has a right to participate in the decision-making process. The point is not who makes the decisions, but the process you use in arriving at the decision.

At a liberal arts college with a strong academic reputation, the academic dean wields an enormous amount of power and influence. The faculty understands that he will closely review hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions. He will also involve himself in the particulars of curriculum revision and other academic matters. His influence results in part from the complexities of a committee structure so intricate that decisions become lost in its machinations. Ironically, the system was the creation of a president who hoped to revitalize faculty participation in the college in the aftermath of his predecessor's benevolent dictatorship. But the cumbersomeness of the structure and the inability of the committees to coordinate themselves left the decisions, by default, to the president and the dean.

Nevertheless, the faculty is not disenchanted; their culture does not place a high value on participation in committee work or administrative tasks. It is also true, and more important, because of the perceived compatibility between their values and those of the administration. Mulkay and Williams conducted a study of a physics department run autocratically by a powerful chairman whose members were quite content to be left out

of decision making because everyone agreed upon the goals.[31] Though running a department differs in scale and complexity from running a college, even at a small liberal arts college the principle is the same: where there is a consensus on norms and expectations among the faculty, and where the administration is perceived to be a trustee of those norms and expectations, faculty will exercise their authority collegially. One assistant professor, when asked what she valued most about the institution said, "the lack of red tape."

The level of bureaucratization, that is, the degree of differentiation and organizational complexity, is not a reliable predictor of whether faculty feel they run their institution. At a major university, whose organization chart would rival that of any multinational corporation, the faculty reports that they make all decisions on "issues that are important to the faculty." In contrast, a faculty member at a medium quality liberal arts college interpreted his situation this way: "I think the faculty feels a certain sense of powerlessness. The administration . . . is not even geographically in the same place we are. It is somewhere else on campus doing God knows what, has ultimate authority over our lives, does all of this like the Wizard of Oz, and is kind of faceless." At an urban comprehensive college, more complex than the liberal arts college, but still simpler than the research university, a professor described the mechanism of hiring new faculty as "the whispering in the ear method; we all go whisper in [the chairman's ear]; tenure criteria are "who you know and who likes you." When asked who has the power at the institutional level, she replied, "Who knows? I don't know what

goes on up there." A better predictor of the ability of faculty to control their professional lives seems to be a "cultural" factor: administrators and faculty stand in an almost inevitable tension with each other, but the tension is minimized to the extent that the outlooks of the faculty and the administration are, or are perceived to be, similar.

An example of how the different "cells" of the model interact and how some units of authority constrain the individual faculty member is found in the research university. If there is an axiom to be gleaned from the literature on faculty authority, it is that direct connections between a faculty member and an external funding agency have the potential of redistributing influence within the university.[31] Specifically, influence shifts from the faculty as a whole to those individuals who have enhanced their position by attracting financial support.[32] This proposition first appeared in the 1960s in response to the rapid growth of federal research support, and we are now able to recognize some secondary effects. One leading political scientist at a major research university lamented the lack of institutional support for research and claimed that this created a virtual "hunting license" to obtain external support. A biologist at another research university frankly conceded that the ability to obtain grants was an important element in hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions. Most significant grants (at least those from the federal government) were awarded only after extensive peer review. They could therefore serve as a surrogate measure of the individual's standing in the field. This is a subtle form of "delocal-

ization," as internal criteria for decision making mingle with external criteria -- that is, standards applied by those outside the institution and, strictly speaking, outside the discipline. But this phenomenon is a sectorial one confined to research universities: approximately 85 percent of federal research funds are awarded to 100 institutions, and federal funds account for nearly all external funding of academic research.[33]

Another trend that parallels the movement from internal to external criteria is the shifting from normative forms of control to instrumental ones. Faculty autonomy is increasingly bound by formal constraints often imposed from outside the university. When a University of California scientist agrees to perform research sponsored by a private company, he must disclose his financial holdings in that company to the California Fair Political Practices Committee, a group whose primary mission is to police the ethical conduct of elected and appointed public officials. Like a politician the faculty member may violate the public trust by using his position for private benefit, but the vehicle for regulation is not one devised by the institution or the profession. Instead, a group which stands apart from the academy monitors the scientist's choice of research topic; in so doing, it reorders (although minimally in this case) the relationship between the university and the faculty member.[34]

Faculty subcultures have institutional as well as disciplinary foundations. To speak of "the faculty interest" is to ignore the coalitional politics that may develop over any particular issue. Divisions between full-time and part-time faculty exist, although, generally, part-time

faculty have no, or only a token, role in university governance. Another division, sometimes more prominent, is between junior and senior faculty. In recent years this has become more acute because expectations for tenure have risen as a function of the low demand and high supply of prospective academics. Under some circumstances junior faculty perceive themselves as being held to standards not met by their senior colleagues; this injects further strain into the already tense process of awarding tenure.

More complicated are the divisions that may arise over collective bargaining. In colleges where collective bargaining has been in place for many years, relations between management and labor can be combative but stable; collective bargaining quickly becomes a fact of life. But the primary forum for articulating faculty interests tends to shift to the contract negotiation. Although campuses with collective bargaining retain their faculty senates, and although by agreement, academic matters are left to those bodies and employment conditions are left to the contract bargaining, there can be turf battles over numerous issues not neatly divisible. On one campus, after negotiating a contract with a recently elected bargaining agent, the administration, which historically had a testy relationship with the faculty, insisted that "consulting with the faculty" according to the terms of the contract meant consulting with the academic senate. The senate, however, remained in the control of a rival union that had lost the election for a bargaining agent. Thus the representation of faculty can become an extremely complicated process. By its very nature, collective bargaining forces the identifi-

cation and articulation of "the" faculty interest, but a diverse group of individuals may have a diverse set of interests. Coalitions within the faculty on most campuses belie the myth of a common interest.

The variety of authority arrangements illustrated by these examples are the outgrowth of several factors, including the history of the institution, the disposition of the administration, and the structure of authority on a campus. Added to this de facto diversity, due mainly to local circumstances, there are now rudiments of a de jure differentiation brought on by some recent complications over the legal status of unionization and collective bargaining in American higher education.

Traditionally, the notion of faculty authority implied the formation of a guild through which the direction of the institution was influenced. To those outside the academy this was somewhat confusing because many different forms of this authority existed in practice. At no time was this perplexity more apparent than in 1980 when the United States Supreme Court was faced with the task of deciding whether faculty members at Yeshiva University were managerial employees and therefore ineligible, under the provisions of federal law, to form a union for the purpose of engaging in collective bargaining.[35] The court agonized over its decision: the opinions of the judges revealed a determined effort to interpret the atypical arrangements found in academia. But as the five-four vote indicated, the result was a deeply divided and confused court. Writing for the majority, which decided that the faculty were not eligible to join a union, Justice Lewis Powell concluded:

> The faculty of Yeshiva University exercises authority which in any other context would unquestionably be managerial. Their authority in academic matters is absolute ....To the extent the industrial analogy applies, the faculty determines within each school the product to be produced, the terms upon which it will be offered, and the customers who will be served.

This provoked a rather sharp dissent from Justice William Brennan.

> The court's perception of the Yeshiva faculty's status is distorted by the rose-colored lens through which it views the governance structure of the modern day university. The court's conclusion that the faculty's professional interests are indistinguishable from those of the administration is bottomed on an idealized model of collegial decision making that is a vestige of the great medieval university. But the university of today bears little resemblance to the "community of scholars" of yesteryear. . . . The task of operating the university enterprise has been transferred from the faculty to an autonomous administration.[36]

Allowing that the Yeshiva decision illustrates that the concept of faculty authority may confuse a detached observer, it is important because it creates a de jure distinction among types of institutions, a distinction reinforced by the administrative rulings of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), and by federal and state legislation. In the United States the authority to unionize and bargain collectively forms a quilt-like pattern. Public universities and colleges receive

their authority to unionize or bargain from state governments. Private institutions fall under federal labor law. The Yeshiva decision and subsequent rulings by the NLRB which are limited to private institutions have thus had a chilling effect on unionization in that sector. In 1981 there were ninety-two private institutions with bargaining agents; in 1983 there were seventy-four, arresting and reversing what had been a consistent growth.[37] Because some groups of colleges are predominantly private and others predominantly public (e.g., community colleges) these de jure constraints are likely to lead to greater diversity in patterns of faculty authority.

To make a final statement on authority, we develop a proposition derived from our model and suggested by the examples. The location of the formal decision -- who awards tenure, who approves curriculum changes, and who sets work rules -- varies by institution and is of obvious importance in any discussion of authority. But it is only part of the picture, the other being constraints on the decision. I propose that a critical difference between a management temperament and an academic temperament is that in the former the constraints are imposed from on high by individuals whose range of vision spans departments and disciplines, but is limited to the particular institution. In an institution with a more academic temperament, the tone is set from below, and although still subject to legal and institutional constraints in the exercise of power, faculty may make all decisions important to them. This helps to explain why, in some institutions, faculty are pleased to be given power by the administration, while in others, such as in the liberal arts

college with the powerful dean, faculty see themselves as the originator of the power delegation. This invisible control over the institution is a critical consideration in a discussion of faculty authority, and it varies in institutions throughout the system.

VALUES AND BELIEFS

As systems of higher education divide into the separate worlds of different work settings and local patterns of governance do the beliefs, attitudes, and ideologies of the academic profession also become fragmented? Or do they serve as the profession's only remaining bond? Edward Shils finds that there is a common academic ethic.

> The fundamental obligations of university teachers for teaching, research and academic citizenship are the same for all academics. All these activities are necessary for the university to perform its indispensable tasks for modern activities and modern intellectual culture and it falls to the individual academic to contribute to the best of his capacity to the performance of those tasks. Not all academics are equally endowed or equally inclined, for whatever reason, to the activities needed to meet these obligations . . . . Nevertheless to abstain from any of these totally and to show no respect for them is contrary to the obligations of an academic career.[38]

Is an academic in one setting kin to his or her counterpart in another, or do local circumstances encourage indigenous ideologies? These issues challenge the profession more acutely than do questions about a division of labor or different approaches to institutional

governance; for the most fundamental, most basic definitional component of any profession is a consistent set of values that integrates a community of individuals and distinguishes it from other professional and occupational groups. If this ideology becomes fragmented, pluralisic, less unifying, the distinctiveness of the profession diminishes; professionalism itself diminishes.

The most sensitive topic is also the most difficult to analyze. Certainly it is not amenable to precise answers or, for that matter, precise questions: asking academics what they value and then tabulating the results is not the same as asking them what they do and tabulating those responses. Methodologies tend to be soft, opinions hard; answers speculative, and stakes high. Discussions of academic ideology are themselves tinted with ideology, and participants rarely hesitate to offer interpretations. Because of the inherently subjective nature of the topic, we are all experts.

In the following section we attempt to disentangle complications and avoid temptations of prescription and advocacy. Here we are guided by Clark's assertion, "It is still the case that academic ideologies may be seen as a form of emotional bonding and even of moral capital for all the levels of organization in higher education -- a relatively strong form compared to that found in most non-academic organizations. But the relatively intangible bonds of symbol, emotion, and morality are evermore pluralistic."[39]

One device for eliciting statements from academics about what they consider important and what they think the profession considers important

is to ask them to construct a model of an "outstanding academic." Across different sectors of higher education the answers were similar in some ways, different in others. To take the differences, whether of degree or kind, statements from individuals in various sectors of higher education follow. They reveal concerns ranging from the humane to the scholarly and illustrate the kinds of circumstances where values come into play. All are responses to questions asking for a description of an outstanding academic.

> I will define that in relation to the community college, with the understanding that if I were to define it in relation to a research institution it would be a different definition . . . A good teacher -- a person who enjoyed teaching and one who would understand the discipline ...would continue to read professional journals within his discipline, but he would also read the literature relating to the community college as a whole; in other words, understanding our philosophy and our mission, our students, and so on. He would be one who would serve on the important committees and occasionally chair those committees . . . . He should get along well with colleagues and his students, understand the discipline, enjoy teaching, and be able to view what he is doing in a larger context. (A community college president)

> I knew a grand old man -- courtly in an almost old fashioned way. In class he was meandering and rambling, but he was a wonder and a very charming man. A lot of students liked to do their dissertations with him because of his personality . . .

[he had] a humanity and ability to relate in an unpretentious way to the students. (English professor, nonelite liberal arts college)

Basically I have been impressed with [someone who] can say what he wants to say in a way that makes sense to me . . .an innovative thinker and a good communicator... a well-rounded perspective . . .I find multidisciplinary scholarship very exciting. (Physics professor, elite liberal arts college)

Truthfulness...in contributing to and increasing our field of knowledge you want to bring in the purest material possible . . .personal integrity as far as representation of yourself, and what you do and do not know. Something else that is important to me, and I don't know if it is important for an academic is simply compassion. (Biology professor, state college)

I said to someone who I respect very much, "It must be great to do research and find yourself very prominent as a result." He said he never did research for that purpose. "I was always out there to learn something," he told me, "that is what drives me." He is such a sincere person that it really hit home. The second attribute is thoroughness, making sure something is right and complete before you send it out. So I guess I would say that it is the lust for knowledge and the willingness to work on something until it is really meaningful as a research piece. (Business professor, research university)

What makes any analysis of values so murky is the platitudinous terminology. No one at a community college would deny that thoroughness is admirable, nor would most people at a research university scoff at the idea of compassion, but while the responses may seem inoffensive to academics, they nevertheless also reveal some differences in emphasis. The question did not ask for a description of an outstanding academic in the specific sector in which the individual is located; it asked for one of an outstanding academic. The models do, however, suggest variations reflecting the cultures of different sectors and a range of priorities and concerns.

Similarities and recurring themes were also evident. Many academics mentioned a lust for knowledge; an inquisitive mind; a cognitive ability to focus on a particular question while understanding the broader context; introducing perspectives from outside the discipline; and, somewhat surprising in its frequency, a concern for the human side of the profession, including an ability to work with people and communicate with them. For example, a young molecular biologist at a leading research university, who is already establishing a national reputation and has a substantial federal research grant that insures him the resources to develop his reputation, described his outstanding academic this way: "Certainly a creative scientist and an interactive person, someone who is able to interact with many kinds of people in terms of training them and being a good teacher .... I have been trained for seven or eight years as a researcher, and I get to a university and become a psychologist, administrator, and writer, none of which I am trained for. The people who can handle

it are great but rare." While his comment gainsays the stereotype of the research professor, obsessed with publication, isolated in his lab, and communicating only through journals and an occasional conference, a professor at a nonelite liberal arts college belies that sector's stereotype -- an individual cast as "Mr. Chips" -- who is concerned only with the moral and personal growth of his student. For him an outstanding academic is someone "who has continued making contributions in his field of expertise by scholarly endeavors"; he ought to "have the ability to convey his enthusiasm for the subject to those he comes in contact with, his students." From two very different settings come similar responses, suggesting at least some agreement with Shils's premise that the "distinctive task of the academic profession is the discovery and the transmission of truth."[40]

How then to interpret the differences and similarities? Are the differences unimportant nuances and the similarities substantial, or is it the other way around? Let me offer at least one possible interpretation.

The importance of socialization ought not be minimized. When asked why they entered the academic profession, nearly all respondents described the decision as one they fell into without carefully considering the career implications. Lured primarily by the interest in a particular subject and inspired perhaps by a teacher of that subject, they sought an opportunity to continue learning about that field. The discipline was clearly the motivation in almost all cases; once in the rarified atmosphere of graduate school, the individual, looking for a further opportunity to continue studying the subject, saw the academic profession as the most inviting. It ensured freedom.

The intensity of the socialization process is severe. Work concerns (often domestic concerns, too, as divorce rates among graduate students attest) are subordinated to scholarly endeavors. Teaching, if the opportunity presents itself, become a means toward the end of writing a dissertation without starving. There is little incentive for a teaching assistant to spend time with students, but a wealth of them to become deeply involved in the subject matter; at no point in an individual's career will he have a broader understanding of his discipline than on the day of his qualifying exams.

The process of socialization into a scholarly career consists of imparting and then balancing two separate cognitive dispositions. The first is a creative, liberating, cerebral approach to problems that encourages the scholar to entertain a range of ideas, consider novel interpretations, and challenge accepted wisdom. The second is a healthy bias against certitude, which constrains the promulgation of unsubstantiated findings and binds the exuberance of the novice researcher. Together, these constraining and liberating outlooks impart an ideology. Lomnitz and Fortes's study of the socialization of scientists describes this ideology as:

> being of paramount importance . . . because it represents a world view, a code of conduct and a character of behavior on the social, cognitive, and emotional levels. it must be internalized by the individual in order to identify with his scattered community. This affords a mutual acknowledgment and a feeling of identity and belonging. . . .It is the acquisition of an

> individual's traits, his ideological commitments, and the recognition by the scientific community which makes him a scientist. [41]

For an academic newly inducted into the scholarly world, no similiar process exists for socialization into the specific college or university where he is to be employed. The former student leaves graduate school with his virgin ideology and finds it frequently violated by the organization. Academics are often surprised by their organizational obligations, committee work, teaching loads, and advising duties. Departmental or college feuds, despite their curious and unfortunate pervasiveness, are always impossible for the academic to explain and are always seen as intruding on his ability to do what he is supposed to do. Said one professor, "I came to my college presuming a rational model, but I learned quickly about bureaucratic politics."

Socialization into the organization comes after an intense introduction into the world of scholarship. The sequence causes the academic to see the second process as inhibiting what he was trained to do in the first. While scholarly socialization is an ordeal willingly entered into, organizational socialization is reluctantly tolerated. At least some of the infused ideology, but usually not all of it, can withstand the organizational influence, which partly explains the similar descriptions of outstanding academics.

A few statistics lend further support to this. Assume that institutions with the sharpest commitment to the scholarly ideology are leading research universities, those operationally defined in the Carnegie

categories as Research Universities I and II. Of the 100 most fertile institutional producers of Ph.D.'s in the sciences, social sciences, and engineering between 1960 and 1981, seventy-seven came from these two categories. During that period, they produced 78.9 percent of the total number of Ph.D.'s. Research I Universities (45 of the top 100 producers) alone produced 58 percent.[42] Therefore, to the extent that various sectors rely upon the doctorate, substantial numbers of academics were first introduced to the profession through the intense scholarly track. With credentials in hand, typically, they are then placed in organizations, each with different commitments, to undergo a quite different introduction to the profession.

An obvious caveat is the absence of significant numbers of doctorates in some institutions, especially community colleges. Table 5 shows a sectorial distribution of doctorate-holding faculty, by percentage.[43] The humanities faculty are not necessarily representative of other disciplines, but the broad trend of lesser reliance on the doctorate in the community college is undoubtedly the same in other fields. Do doctorates in the community college have different outlooks than their nondoctorate colleagues? Very little research is available on this topic (it would be a good test of a socialization hypothesis). One recent study showed similarities, but it dealt mainly with instructional goals and techniques, not with broader views about the profession.[44] Another study, now somewhat dated, showed that Ph.D.'s in the community colleges were more ambivalent about the goals of the community college than those without the doctorate.[45] One of our respondents, an instructor

in English at a community college, articulated the nature of this division. "The Ph.D. in this place separates people from other people. Now, I have no particular respect for a system that sets up arbitrary boundaries in the way of obtaining a Ph.D. At the same time, those who have gotten through it have some interest and respect for literature and maybe even a passion for writing. . . .The M.A. mentality is to get through and get a job; their real lives are perhaps lived elsewhere than on the page." While the evidence is mixed, the weight is on the side of the Ph.D. carrying some influence that endures despite the organizational setting.

Table 5 about here

The similarities across the sectors -- the language used to describe an outstanding academic, the respect for research, and the like, may be partly explained by an intense and sequential socialization. Some residual symbolic bonding remains from an academic's training: a belief in the value of transmitting knowledge, familiarity with the subject matter, and being able to work with people.

Academics are able to articulate a general model, but they may not agree on its specific applications, or they may not adopt it as their own personal ideal. Some professors who described an outstanding academic in very conventional terms and who conceded that such an individual could never exist in their institutions are not necessarily eager to leave their positions for a "better" one. If, indeed they do wish to leave, they occasionally resemble the political scientist at a state

college who spoke with fervor about his extraacademic involvement in political and community activities and how the flexibility of his present position allowed him to do that. Having made that statement, he continued: "I still wistfully dream on occasion about holding a position at a major institution. I think I would welcome the pressure to write articles and publish if I had the ability to do it. But I won't do it. It's too late now. I'm old and set."

Strains on the common ideology will persist and increase as the similarities among the different sectors decrease. To be sure, the Ph.D., except in the community colleges (but even there, in some cases), remains valued, and in the current academic labor market, most institutions will have little difficulty in requiring recruits to have it. Since nearly all institutions pay some lip service to the objective of discovering as well as transmitting knowledge (the community college is again the exception), so the research norm will not vanish, although the increasingly broad definitions of research will lead to a differentiated research community. Those factors notwithstanding, the trend toward a greater fragmentation and a more pluralistic definition of the profession will accelerate. Socialization imparts norms, but mutual interaction reinforces them. If academics continue to define their values to make them consistent with their institutional settings, if they tend to define professional concerns locally, and if research and professional associations continue to exhibit distinctly local patterns, we can expect the centrifugal forces to strengthen and challenge the already tenuous normative core of the profession.

CONCLUSION

The academic profession exhibits important behavioral and ideological differences across institutional sectors: distinct cultures linked to the missions of various college and universities are emerging, and different research contexts are influencing the nature and quantity of research. A "fault line," postulated by Fulton and Trow, separates teaching styles and classroom objectives of academics from one sector to another: where the teaching load is heavy, the courses general, and the audiences diverse, instructors find different pedagogical rewards than those coming from training future leaders in the disciplines in graduate schools. Fragmentation is a fundamental feature of the academic profession.

We begin to understand the significance of this institutional fragmentation by contrasting it with another apparent source of fragmentation: the disciplines. Tony Becher tells us (chap. 5) that disciplines have very different cultures. It is difficult to imagine the physicist understanding the intellectual sparks that ignite the inquisitive fires of a political scientist; for that matter, the theoretical physicist is often perplexed by his experimental brethren. Disciplines and subdisciplines vary by styles of presentation, preferred modes of investigation, and by the "permeability of their boundaries," the degree to which they draw upon other fields and respond to nonscientific constituencies.[46]

But for all these differences, the disciplines share a common ethos, a compensatory integrating mechanism. Clark wrote that the norms of science are the norms of the (academic) profession;[47] is it not also

true that the norms of science are the norms of the disciplines? However broadly "knowledge" is defined, disciplines impart a respect for it. They also establish such procedural expectations as the sharing of information among researchers, the importance of disinterestedly reviewing evidence, and the privilege -- indeed the responsibility -- of exercising self-regulation since "only the holy can know what is holy." Insofar as the disciplines fragment the profession, then, a paradox arises. Ben-David, in his discussion of science as a profession, explains that as fields of study develop and become more sophisticated, they also become more distinct from other fields and more protective of their body of knowledge. If so, they also become more committed to a professional temperament, in this sense, then, the separation of the disciplines is countered by an increasingly stronger commitment to a scientific professional ethos.

If we look at the profession across institutions, the situation is different; it is difficult to find any mechanism, normative or instrumental, to compensate for the fragmentation. Academics in different sectors are developing distinct interests. This may be so because the constituencies of higher education vary by institutional setting. Diverse student populations, state governments, the federal government, and business present demands that vary by sector, resulting in a variety of organizational cultures requiring academics to respond differently. In settings where collective bargaining was habitual, our respondents regretted the introduction of a union. But they considered it unavoidable in light of their collective powerlessnesss relative to their institution, the system, or the public authorities -- a condition that might be absent elsewhere. The "community"

for a community college instructor is not like the community for someone in a research university. Graduate students at a research university have different expectations than undergraduates have at a smaller, teaching-oriented college. The relationship of the academic profession to society becomes defined in terms of the sector, particularly the sector's constituencies.

Higher education in the United States is clearly evolving toward sharper distinctions among institutions. Inevitably, for the professoriat, a more diverse set of interests is being built around the local conditions for each institution. It would not be amiss to speculate that separate professions or separate cadres of academics, each with its interests endemic to its own institutional setting, may sprout, root, and endure.

NOTES

The author wishes to acknowledge with appreciation the assistance of his colleagues at the UCLA Comparative Higher Education Research Group, especially to Burton R. Clark and Gary Rhoades for their advice, and to Marie Freeman and Mitchell Bard for their research assistance.

1. Clark, Higher Education System.
2. Wilson, Academic Man.
3. Jencks and Riesman, Academic Revolution, p. 480.
4. Ibid., p. 27.
5. Ladd and Lipset, Divided Academy, esp. chaps. 4 and 10.
6. Keller, Academy Strategy, p. 30.
7. Ibid., p. 39.
8. National Center for Education Statistics, Condition of Education 1983, pp. 94, 95.
9. Ibid.
10. Weathersby, "State Colleges in Transition," p. 26.
11. Norman Birnbaum cited in Froomkin, "Research Universities," p. 34.
12. Kerr, Uses of the University.
13. Pfinster, "Role of the Liberal Arts College," p. 165.
14. Ibid., p. 163.
15. Ibid., p. 166.
16. Metzger, "Academic Freedom in Delocalized Academic Institutions," p. 15.
17. Clark, Higher Education System, p. 106.
18. Fulton and Trow, "Research Activity in American Higher Education."
19. National Science Foundation, Activities of Science and Engineering Faculty in Universities and Four-Year Colleges.

20. Fulton and Trow, p. 54.
21. Ladd, "Work Experience of American College Professors," p. 4.
22. Ibid., p. 5.
23. Wilson, Academic Man, p. 194.
24. Caplow and McGee, Academic Marketplace, p. 189.
25. Light, "Introduction: The Structure of the Academic Professions," p. 16.
26. Michalak and Friedrich, "Research Productivity and Teaching Effectiveness at a Small Liberal Arts College," p. 585.
27. American Political Science Association, "Learned Societies," p. 2.
28. Cameron, "Organizational Adaptation and Higher Education," p. 136.
29. Clark, Higher Education System, p. 130.
30. Mulkay and Williams."A Sociological Study of a Physics Department," pp. 68-82.
31. Clark, "Faculty Organization and Authority," p. 49.
32. Kerr, Uses of the University, pp. 52-55.
33. National Science Foundation, Federal Support to Universities, Colleges, and Selected Nonprofit Institutions, Fiscal Year 1980.
34. Sanger, "University of California Puts Limits on Private Research Pacts," New York Times (21 August 1983), p. 22.
35. U.S. Supreme Court, NLRB v. Yeshiva, p. 686.
36. Ibid., p. 702.
37. Douglas (with De Bona), Directory of Faculty Contracts and Bargaining Agents, p. VIII.
38. Shils, Academic Ethic, p. 104.
39. Clark, "Academic Culture," p. 25.

40. Shils, Academic Ethic, p. 3.

41. Lomnitz and Fortes, "Socialization of Scientists," p. 27.

42. National Science Foundation, Science and Engineering Doctorates: 1960-1981, pp. 85-86.

43. Atelsek and Gomberg, "Selected Characteristics of Full-Time Humanities Faculty," p. 23.

44. Green, "Does the Doctorate Make a Difference?"

45. Bloom, Gillie, and Leslie, "Goals and Ambivalence."

46. Becher, "The Cultural View."

47. Clark, Higher Education System, p. 93.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Political Science Foundation. "Learned Societies: Self-Study and Institutional Planning." A Research Proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D.C., 1984.

Atelsek, Frank J., and Irene L. Gomberg, "Selected Characteristics of Full-Time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1979." Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, August, 1981.

Becher, Tony. "The Cultural View." In Perspectives on Higher Education: Eight Disciplinary and Comparative Views, ed. Burton R. Clark. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1984. Pp. 165-198.

Bloom, Karen L., Angelo C. Gillie, and Larry L. Leslie. Goals and Ambivalence: Faculty Values and the Community College Philosophy. Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University. Report no. 13. University Park, Pa., November 1971.

Cameron, Kim S. "Organizational Adaptation and Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education 55, no. 2 (1984): 122 - 144.

Caplow, Theodore, and Reese J. McGee. The Academic Marketplace. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965.

Clark, Burton R. "Faculty Culture." In The Study of Campus Cultures, ed. Terry F. Lunsford. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.

_____. "Academic Culture." Higher Education Research Group Working Paper, YHERG-42. New Haven: Yale University, 1980.

_____. The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Douglas, Joel N. (with Lorraine DeBona). Directory of Faculty Contacts and Bargaining Agents in Institutions of Higher Education. Vol. 10. National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions. New York: Baruch College of the City University of New York, January, 1984.

Froomkin, Joseph. "The Research Universities." In The Crisis in Higher Education, ed. Joseph Froomkin. Academy of Political Science. Proceedings. 35, no. 2(1983): 23-33.

Fulton, Oliver, and Martin Trow. "Research Activity in American Higher Education." In Teachers and Students, ed. Martin Trow. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Green, Kenneth C. "Does the Doctorate Make a Difference?" in The Humanities and Sciences in Two-Year Colleges, ed. Florence B. Brawer. Los Angeles: Eric Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1980. Pp. 102-112.

Jencks, Christopher, and David Riesman. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1969.

Keller, George. Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Ladd, Everett Carll, Jr., and Seymour Martin Lipset. The Divided Academy. New York: W. W. Norton, 1975.

_____. "The Work Experience of American College Professors: Some Data and an Argument." Current Issues in Higher Education 1979. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979. Pp. 3-12.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Wagner Thielens, Jr. The Academic Mind: Professors and Politics. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.

Lee, Barbara, and James P. Begin. "Criteria for Evaluating the Managerial Status of College Faculty: Applications of Yeshiva University by the NLRB." Journal of College and University Law 10, no. 4 (1984): 515-537.

Light, Donald. "The Structure of the Academic Professions." Sociology of Education 47, no. 1 (1974): 2-29.

Light, D.W., Jr., L.R. Mardsen, and T.C. Corl. The Impact of the Academic Revolution on Faculty Careers. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1973.

Lomnitz, Larissa, and Jacqueline Fortes. "Socialization of Scientists: The Internationalization of a Myth." Unpublished paper, n.d.

Metzger, Walter P. "Academic Freedom in Delocalized Academic Institutions." In Dimensions of Academic Freedom, ed. Walter Metzger. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1969. Pp. 1-33.

Michalak, Stanley, Jr., and Robert J. Friedrich. "Research Productivity and Teaching Effectiveness at a Small Liberal Arts College." Journal of Higher Education 52, pt. 6 (1981): 578-597.

Mulkay, M.J., and Anthony T. Williams. "A Sociological Study of a Physics Department." British Journal of Sociology 22, pt. 1 (1971): 68-82.

National Center for Education Statistics. The Condition of Education 1983, Washington, D.C., 1984.

National Science Foundation, Science and Engineering Doctorates: 1960-1981. Washington, D.C., 1983.

_____. Activities of Science and Engineering Faculty in Universities and Four-Year Colleges. Washington, D.C., 1981.

_____. Federal Support to Universities, Colleges, and Selected Nonprofit Institutions, Fiscal Year 1980. Washington, D.C., 1982.

Pfinster, Allan O. "The Role of the Liberal Arts College: A Historical Overview of the Debates." Journal of Higher Education 55, no. 2 (1984): 145-170.

Shils, David E. The Academic Ethic. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Stadtman, Verne A. Academic Adaptations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

U.S. Supreme Court. NLRB v. Yeshiva. In U.S. Reports 44. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980. Pp. 672-702.

Weathersby, George B. "State Colleges in Transition." In The Crisis in Higher Education, ed. Joseph Froomkin. The Academy of Political Science. Proceedings 35, no. 2 (1983): 23-33.

Wilson, Logan. The Academic Man. London: Oxford University Press, 1942.

Wenzlau, Thomas E. "The Outlook for Liberal-Arts Colleges." In The Crisis in Higher Education, ed. Joseph Froomkin. Academy of Political Science. Proceedings. 35, no. 2 (1983): 1-13.

TABLE 1

RESEARCH ACTIVITY OF FACULTY BY TYPE AND QUALITY OF INSTITUTION

(percentage of faculty)

Research Activity	Universities			Four-Year Colleges			Community Colleges	All Institutions
	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low		
Inactive, not currently publishing	9	14	21	23	37	48	70	33
Active, no recent publications	12	15	23	23	26	24	16	20
Few current publications	51	52	46	45	34	26	12	37
Many current publications	28	20	11	9	3	3	2	11

Source: Trow and Fulton, "Research Activity in American Higher Education," 1975.

TABLE 2
HOURS PER WEEK DEVOTED TO PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
IN DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

	All	Engineering	Life Sciences	Biological Sciences	Physical Sciences	Social Sciences	Economics	Political Sciences
Total instructional	14.9	15.5	13.4	13.5	13.8	18.2	17.2	23.1
Classroom	4.3	4.6	4.1	4.2	3.2	4.9	5.1	5.6
Other	10.5	10.8	9.2	9.3	10.6	13.3	12.1	17.4
Total Research	15.6	14.7	18.8	20.0	20.5	10.5	14.1	7.8
Total public services, administration, & miscellaneous professional	9.5	10.0	11.0	10.2	8.0	8.4	8.8	6.1
Public service	1.6	1.7	2.2	1.3	.6	1.6	2.2	1.3
Adminstration	5.3	6.1	5.4	5.5	5.3	4.8	5.1	3.3
Miscellaneous professional	2.6	2.1	3.4	3.4	2.2	2.0	1.6	1.4
Total outside income producing activities	4.2	5.8	3.6	3.7	3.9	4.8	2.8	3.8
Consulting	1.2	3.3	.8	.8	1.1	.9	1.3	.6
Publication	2.4	1.7	2.1	2.3	2.5	3.6	1.1	2.9
Other	.6	.8	.7	.6	.3	.3	.4	.3

(table continues).

TABLE 2 (continued)
HOURS PER WEEK DEVOTED TO PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
IN DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

	All	Engineering	Life Sciences	Biological Sciences	Physical Sciences	Social Sciences	Economics	Political Sciences	
Continuing & educational professional enrichment	4.1		3.0	3.9	4.2	3.4	6.1	4.7	6.0
All activities	48.2		49.1	50.6	51.7	49.6	48.1	47.6	46.8

Source: NSF, "Activities of Science and Engineering Faculty," 1981.

TABLE 3
HOURS PER WEEK DEVOTED TO PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
IN NONDOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

	All	Engineering	Life Sciences	Biological Sciences	Physical Sciences	Social Sciences	Economics	Political Sciences
Total instructional	21.6	23.2	21.0	21.1	23.9	19.4	17.6	14.9
Classroom	8.4	9.8	8.2	8.4	10.0	7.4	7.9	6.6
Other	13.2	13.3	12.8	12.7	13.9	12.0	9.6	8.3
Total research	5.0	3.2	6.5	6.7	3.8	5.9	7.7	7.0
Total public services, administration, & miscellaneous professional	7.4	6.0	8.5	8.5	6.8	6.5	8.9	6.9
Public service	2.1	1.2	4.3	4.4	1.4	1.6	2.1	1.4
Adminstration	4.3	3.6	3.6	3.5	4.4	3.8	5.9	4.0
Miscellaneous professional	1.0	1.2	.6	.6	.9	1.1	.9	1.5
Total outside income producing activities	3.1	10.3	1.7	1.2	2.7	2.1	2.2	3.4
Consulting	1.2	4.8	.3	.3	.5	.5	1.5	.1
Publication	1.3	4.4	.6	.6	1.6	1.4	.1	2.7
Other	.7	1.2	.9	.3	.6	.2	.5	.6

(table continues)

TABLE 3 (continued)
HOURS PER WEEK DEVOTED TO PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
IN NONDOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

	All	Engineering	Life Sciences	Biological Sciences	Physical Sciences	Social Sciences	Economics	Political Sciences
Continuing educational professional enrichment	5.5	3.2	5.5	5.6	4.9	6.7	6.0	5.8
All activities	42.7	43.6	43.2	43.2	42.1	40.6	42.3	37.9

Source: NSF, "Activities of Science and Engineering Faculty," 1981.

TABLE 4

PRIMARY PROFESSIONAL INTERESTS OF
FACULTY MEMBERS BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE
(percentage by faculty)

Primary Interest	Universities			Four-Year Colleges			Community Colleges	All Institutions
	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low		
Very heavily in research	9	7	4	4	1	1	1	4
Both research and teaching but leaning toward research	41	33	24	22	11	9	4	20
Both research and teaching but leaning toward teaching	35	37	39	39	37	34	18	34
Very heavily in teaching	15	23	33	35	51	56	77	43

Source: Trow and Fulton, "Research Activity in American Higher Education," 1975.

TABLE 5
HUMANITIES AND ENGLISH FACULTY BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE
AND HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED
(percentage of faculty)

	Humanities				English			
	Doctorate	Master	Other		Doctorate	Master	Other	
Universities								
Private	90.4	8.4	1.3	(n=4,612)	87.2	11.6	1.1	(n=1,654)
Public	85.7	12.3	1.9	(n=11,992)	77.5	19.9	2.6	(n=5,147)
Four-year colleges								
Private	70.7	28.4	0.9	(n=13,229)	63.5	35.8	0.7	(n=5,487)
Public	72.6	25.3	2.1	(n=14,689)	64.9	32.6	2.8	(n=6,767)
Community colleges								
Private	18.6	74.3	7.2	(n=1,383)	18.2	70.4	11.4	(n=869)
Public	20.0	74.5	5.6	(n=12,682)	16.4	77.8	5.8	(n=8,153)
All institutions	63.6	33.8	2.6	(n=58,587)	52.7	44.0	3.4	(n=28,076)

Source: Atelsek and Gomberg, "Selected Characteristics of Full-Time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1979," 1981.